

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 and 37-39 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 3, 4, 13, 22 and 34 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-7 of the Reply. Claims 2, 5, 20 and 26 have been canceled.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the teleconference of August 8, 2007.

Since the amended limitations merely emphasize subject matter as originally claimed, these limitations should already have been considered during an initial search in connection with the subject application. Pursuant to MPEP §714.13, applicants' representative submits that the amendments to these claims "only requires a cursory review by the Examiner" and thus, entry and consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 13-19 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 13-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wang *et al.* (US Patent 6,907,433). It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Wang *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants' claimed subject matter relates to a system and method to facilitate mapping between disparate domain models such as an object oriented programming model and a relational database model. Specifically, the system discloses an object schema component that provides a mechanism for providing a bridge between a transient graph of objects and a related persistent data store. In particular, the object schema provides metadata describing a given set of

classes in addition to a program assembly containing type definitions. The metadata can subsequently be utilized by a mapping system to translate relational data to and from user objects during a materialization or persistence process. Independent claim 13 recites: *an object schema generation system comprising: a code reader component adapted to read code from a program or set of programs; an object schema generation component that retrieves or is provided with code from the code reader component and produces an object schema which provides metadata concerning objects to facilitate persistence of object data to a data store, wherein the generated object schema is utilized together with a relational schema and a mapping schema to map object data to tables in the data store; wherein the mapping schema provides the mapping between the object schema and the relational schema, and the relational schema utilizes metadata associated with the data store to generate an implementation specific format that represents the data store structure; and **wherein the object schema generation component utilizes rule based artificial intelligence to produce the schema.*** Wang *et al.* does not expressly or inherently disclose the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' claimed subject matter as recited in the subject claims.

Wang *et al.* discloses a system for managing object to relational, one-to-many mapping. The system uses mapping of meta-data to generate instructions to manipulate target objects and relationships in a relational database. The mapping of meta-data contains information as to how object classes of the object model map to tables in the database and how relationships map to foreign keys. (See col. 2, lines 3-25).

In contrast, applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a system for mapping object components to relational components. The object schema generation system includes code reader component, object schema generator component and data store information component. Code reader component is adapted to read and/or retrieve information from a particular program or group of programs. The code reader component can provide the retrieved code to the schema generation component in real time, as it is being read or transferred en masse upon complete reading of the code. Code generation component can subsequently utilize the code provided by the code reader component to produce a schema. The code generation component can generate classes and members of classes to represent specified objects. The code generation component can also generate a relationships section to define the relations amongst classes and members. Classes, members of classes and relationships are all provided to facilitate persistence to a data

store. It should be appreciated that schema generation component can employ artificial intelligence technologies to generate a schema from provided code. For example, the generation component could utilize a rule-based system to provide the heuristics necessary to build a schema. (See pg. 18, line 12-pg. 19, line 9).

Wang *et al.* merely discloses a class mapping tool that assists developers in defining how an object model maps to a relational database. Specifically, the class mapping tool is utilized to map the three object classes (Employee, Address and Phone Number) of the object model to three tables in a relational database. Wang *et al.* does not disclose a system wherein the schema generation component can employ artificial intelligence technologies to generate a schema from provided code. Accordingly, Wang *et al.* is silent with regard to an object schema generation system, ***wherein the object schema generation component utilizes rule based artificial intelligence to produce the schema.***

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that Wang *et al.* fails to expressly or inherently disclose applicants' claimed subject matter as recited in independent claim 13 (and claims 14-19 which depend there from). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be deemed allowable.

II. Rejection of Claims 20 and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang *et al.*, in view of Koller *et al.* (US Patent Publication 2002/0103793). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Wang *et al.* and Koller *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Koller *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Wang *et al.* with respect to independent claim 13 (which claim 21 depends there from). And, claim 20 has been canceled. Thus, the claimed subject matter as recited in claims 20 and 21 is not obvious over the combination of Wang *et al.* and Koller *et al.*, and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

III. Rejection of Claim 1-12, 22-35 and 37-39 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-12, 22-35 and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wotring *et al.* (US Patent 6,853,997) in view of Wang *et al.* It is respectfully

submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Wotring *et al.* and Wang *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must show an un rebutted *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicants' disclosure. See *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants' claimed subject matter relates to a system and method to facilitate mapping between disparate domain models such as an object oriented programming model and a relational database model. Specifically, the system discloses an object schema component that provides a mechanism for providing a bridge between a transient graph of objects and a related persistent data store. Independent claims 1, 22 and 34 recite similar limitations, namely: a computer executable data structure comprising: *a first data structure that describes one or more classes which define programmatic objects; a second data structure that describes members of each class; and a third data structure that describes relationships between objects, wherein the described classes, members, and relationships provide information that can be utilized by a computer to persist object data to a database, wherein an object schema is generated and utilized together with a relational schema and a mapping schema to map the programmatic objects to tables in the database; wherein the mapping schema provides the mapping between the object schema and the relational schema, and the relational schema utilizes metadata associated with the database to generate an implementation specific format that represents the database structure; wherein members of a class include fields and properties; and wherein the member properties include an alias attribute to identify a public member that is to be utilized in place of a private member.* Wotring *et al.* and Wang *et al.*, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest such aspects of the claimed subject matter.

Wotring *et al.* discloses a system and method for allowing data to be shared without requiring that the data be remodeled to fit a common format or convention. The users of the data may keep their own data formats and may dynamically transform the data contained in their structure into a structure compatible with another definition without having to physically change their data or its structure. Specifically, the data is transformed from a Relational Database Management System (RDBMS) to a hierarchical format. Since RDBMS information is stored in separate tables joined through a specified key structure, information needs to be repackaged as a whole for use in data communication across a local area network (LAN), or a wide area network (WAN). The system discloses transforming data stored in relational format into a hierarchical format, such as a markup language. As information is transformed into the hierarchical structure from a RDBMS, the information then assumes the hierarchical representation of the logical records contained in the database. (See col. 2, line 63-col. 3, line 52).

In contrast, applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a system for mapping object components to relational components. The object schema of the system provides one portion of a three-part mapping. The other two schema components are a mapping schema and a relational schema. The object schema component describes data classes as well as relations there between as specified in an object-oriented model, for example. Relational schema component utilizes metadata associated with a database to generate an implementation neutral or implementation specific format that represents the precise database structure and data. Mapping schema component provides the mapping between the object schema and the relational schema. (See pg. 9, line 30-pg. 10, line 26). Furthermore, members associated with each class to be persisted are identified. Members can include class fields and properties. Members can be compound members comprising at least one field or property and another compound member. Thus, a compound member can be an array. Furthermore, it should be appreciated that member attributes can also be specified. For example, a member can be identified as a key or a member can identify an alias. (See pg. 22, lines 3-13).

Whereas, Wotring *et al.* merely discloses transforming data stored in relational format into a hierarchical format such as a markup language. The system provides for mapping each of the plurality of elements in the hierarchical data entity to information in a relational dataset, and transforming the relational dataset into corresponding mapped elements in the hierarchical data entity to form a hierarchical data structure. Wotring *et al.* does not disclose identifying a name

of a member to be used as an alias to query a private number. Accordingly, Wotring *et al.* is silent with regard to a computer executable data structure, ***wherein members of a class include fields and properties; and wherein the member properties include an alias attribute to identify a public member that is to be utilized in place of a private member.***

Wang *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Wotring *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1, 22 and 34 (which claims 2-12, 23-33 and 35-39 depend there from). Wang *et al.* discloses a system for managing object to relational, one-to-many mapping. The system uses mapping of meta-data to generate instructions to manipulate target objects and relationships in a relational database. The mapping of meta-data contains information as to how object classes of the object model map to tables in the database and how relationships map to foreign keys. (See col. 2, lines 3-25).

As stated *supra*, applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a system for mapping object components to relational components that describes data classes. The members associated with each class to be persisted are identified. Members can include class fields and properties. Members can be compound members comprising at least one field or property and another compound member. Thus, a compound member can be an array. Furthermore, it should be appreciated that member attributes can also be specified. For example, a member can be identified as a key or a member can identify an alias. (See pg. 22, lines 3-13). Wang *et al.* merely discloses that the one-to-many relationships can be composed into two groups, privately owned and independent. Wherein, a privately owned relationship is one in which the target object is a dependent part of the source object and cannot exist on its own without the source object. (See col. 4, lines 29-36). Wang *et al.* does not disclose identifying a name of a member to be used as an alias to query a private number. Accordingly, Wang *et al.* is silent with regard to a computer executable data structure, ***wherein members of a class include fields and properties; and wherein the member properties include an alias attribute to identify a public member that is to be utilized in place of a private member.***

Thus, the combination of Wotring *et al.* and Wang *et al.* does not teach the claimed subject matter. In view of the aforementioned deficiencies of Wotring *et al.* and Wang *et al.*, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn with respect to independent claims 1, 22 and 34 (which claims 2-12, 23-33 and 35-39 depend respectively there from).

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP567US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731